DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 769 CG 017 898

AUTHOR Schnellmann, Jo; Gibbons, Judith L.
TITLE Microinequities in the Classroom: The Perception by Minorities and Women of a Less Favorable Climate in the Classroom.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 24-28, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; *Classroom Environment; *College Students; *Females; Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Sex Differences; *Social Bias; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

Faculty beliefs regarding the achievement potential of women and minority students may be communicated through microinequities in everyday exchanges. To determine whether women and minority students perceive a less encouraging classroom atmosphere than white male students, 941 students were surveyed using a questionnaire designed for this study. Results indicated that, overall, students perceived instructors as encouraging and welcoming comments or questions in class; however, minority students felt less encouraged than caucasians, women less than men, and undergraduates less than graduate students. A pattern emerged in which conscious efforts to affirm and encourage women and minority students were negated by nonconscious behaviors such as rarely calling on them, interrupting, using the generic he, and addressing the class as if no women or minorities were present. Although instructors were not viewed as being particularly partial to men, men reported being more likely to seek help from an instructor. The findings suggest that differential treatment may be a contributing factor in the lower academic aspirations of women and minorities. (The study questionnaire is appended.) (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED251769

Microinequities in the Classroom: The Perception by Minorities and Women of a Less Favorable Climate in the Classroom

Jo Schnellmann, Judith L. Gibbons

St. Louis University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jo Schnellmann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Running head: Microinequities in the classroom

CG 017898

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine whether women and minority students perceive that they experience a less encouraging classroom atmosphere than white male students.

Results of a questionnaire survey of 941 university students show that minority and female students perceive a less encouraging classroom atmosphere as a consequence of microinequities; ie., trivial, nonconscious, discriminatory verbal and nonverbal behaviors of faculty. Perceptions by minority students seem to indicate that microinequities negate conscious efforts by faculty to encourage them. The aggregation of microinequities may be a contributing factor to the lower academic achievement of women and minorities.

According to the latest U.S. census figures, enrollment of women in colleges and universities throughout the U.S. has increased by 63% since 1970. At the university where this study was conducted, the increase in women students has not been so spectacular. However, the latest available figures (1975-1982) do indicate an overall increase of 16% since 1975. In contrast there has not been a comparable percentage increase in the number of women graduates. For example, in 1975 the entering class was 54% male and 46% female and by 1977 the entering class composition was 47% male and 53% female. Yet when this class graduated in 1981, the male/female ratio had shifted to 58% male and 42% female.

This reversal in the male to female ratio becomes more meaningful when it is noted that upon enrollment in 1977, females had out-performed males on most indicators of success in college. They had higher high-school grade point averages, higher SAT scores, came from higher socioeconomic backgrounds and their parents had higher educational levels (Kalsbeek, 1982). In short, they out-performed men in everything except athletics and expectations of success. Fully 30% of the women had indicated that they did not expect to graduate, as compared to 12% of the men. This pattern has repeated itself for every class up to, and including the entering class in 1982 (Kalsbeek, 1982).

These expectations of lower academic achievement do not occur suddenly when a girl finishes high-school and becomes a college woman. Since the stereotype holds that females possess few or none of the characteristics which are considered essential to success in competitive situations (Bem and Bem, 1970), from birth they are taught to believe that they are not expected to achieve academically. These expectations are subtly reinforced throughout their school years (Dweck, 1978).

Along the same lines, and although enrollment of minority students,

specifically blacks, has remained stable at this university, university data show that only 35% of all entering blacks graduate as compared to 65% of entering caucasian students (Kalsbeek, 1984). This excessive rate of attrition may be due, at least in part, to societal expectations. As reported by Noonan and Simpson (cited in Hall, 1982) minorities, especially blacks, have noted that faculty often expect them to be academically incompetent. Thus, in general, minority students are believed to come from academically and socially disadvantaged backgrounds which limit their ability to succeed.

Research has demonstrated (Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968) that teachers can affect the achievement of students through the expectations which they have for these students. In the college or university setting, and due to their own, probably nonconscious, beliefs regarding the achievement potential of women and minorities, faculty may inadvertently create "self-fulfilling prophecies" of lower academic achievement for minority and women students. Thus, the expectations that they have for these students may help reinforce stereotypes for themselves, their students and society.

These expectations which create negative "self-fulfilling prophecies" are commonly communicated through microinequities which occur in the course of everyday interchanges. Microinequities, according to Rowe (1970), are instances in which individuals are either singled out or ignored due to race, sex or age. Any disparaging comment, behavioral act or oversight which affects only members of a given group, may in and of itself seem trivial and often goes unnoticed. It is the aggregation of these subtle and/or inadvertent incidents which, as Hall (1982, p.5) says "...can do the most damage because they often occur without the full awareness of the professor or student".

Microinequities may be verbal or nonverbal. Along the verbal dimension, an example may be knowing students names, for it is commonly agreed that calling a student by name reinforces the sense of being known as an individual. It is for this reason that faculty are often encouraged to make an effort to learn students' names. However, male and female faculty are often surprised to discover that they know the names of proportionately more men students than names of women students in their classes and tend to confuse the names of women more often (Hall, 1982). Thus the effort to learn students' names backfires when Lois is called Lisa, or Maureen is called Colleen. This does not reinforce being known as an individual but rather reinforces being known as a member of a group so inconsequential that a person in authority cannot distinguish among its members.

Another example is interrupting, contradicting or bullying which according to Goffman (1967) not only reflect the relative status of the members in an interaction but are all privileges of the superior. When a professor interrupts a student, s/he is demonstrating higher status. However, when a professor interrupts women more often then men, s/he indicates that men students have higher status than women students. Since interruptions follow a hierarchy of status (Eakins and Eakins, cited in Henley, 1977), the professor who allows male students to consistently interrupt female students is subtly indicating that the male has higher status. Additionally, this indicates that the interrupting male is the leader, for studies of leadership have consistently shown that those who are the most verbal and interrupt with impunity are more often perceived as leaders (Bavelas, Hastorf, Gross, and Kite, 1965).

Beyond modes of address and interruptions, additional verbal cues which may further indicate to female students that they are discounted are the

consistent us of the generic "he" or "man" to represent both men and women; (ie. man is a creature of habit..., throughout the ages, man...) and addressing the class as if no women or minorities were present (ie. when you were a boy..., we know that members of minorities are...). Reinforcing the stereotypes of male achievement and female inaptitude is also done by phrasing classroom examples in such a way that professionals, such as doctors, lawyers, etc. are "he" while clients, neurotics, the weak and the irrational are "she".

Differential reinforcement for intellectual participation is another example of microinequities. Instances of this are evident in responding more extensively to men's comments (Hall, 1982) and crediting opinion to their "author" more frequently when the "author" is male (ie. as Bill pointed out...). Sometimes in an effort to avoid embarrassing a student, professors shy away from asking difficult questions of students whom they feel may not know the answer. In fact, when a student is asked a difficult or higher order question, and is able to respond, this not only increases the student's self-esteem but reinforces the professor as well. The likelihood of the professor calling upon the same student increases. Not being called upon, or being called upon exclusively to answer easy or factual questions reinforces a sense of inaptitude.

Along the nonverbal dimension, Hall (1982, p.6) notes that "...nonverbal behaviors can signal inclusion or exclusion of group members; indicate interest and attention or the opposite; communicate expectations of student success or failure; and foster or impede students' confidence in their own abilities to learn specific tasks and procedures". Thus, when a verbal expression of interest is coupled with a nonverbal expression of irritation or boredom, the student may pick-up on the latter and react by withdrawing into non-participation.

Eye contact is considered to be one of the most powerful nonverbal cues. Numerous investigators have found that people look more at those they feel more positive towards, and that establishing eye contact is often an invitation to speak or participate (Cook, 1977). Thorne (1979) found that instructors often ask a question and then make eye contact with men only, as if only men students were expected to respond. Likewise, in laboratory situations, group project or demonstration, some students may be given eye or other nonverbal signals that they are expected to take over. This is commonly done by maintain eye contact with one or two students while explaining the procedure. Other times, instructors will inadvertently allow others to be "squeezed out" from viewing demonstrations or lab procedures. In both instances, some students are led to doubt their competence.

The purpose of this study was to examine whether students perceptions of classroom atmospheres or climates were related to their race, gender, or status as graduate or undergraduate students. It was hypothesized that minority students, of both genders, would perceive a less encouraging atmosphere than caucasian students. It was also hypothesized that female students, would perceive a less favorable climate than male students with undergraduate female students perceiving a less favorable climate than graduate female students.

METHOD

Instrument:

A 33-item forced choice questionnaire was developed specifically for this study. The items were based on a report issued by the Association of American Colleges Project on the Status and Education of Women (Hall, 1982). The first 7 items of the questionnaire were demographic in nature. The remaining 26 questions were designed to assess the incidence of microinequities (Appendix A). Reliability analysis on the questionnaire resulted in a coefficient alpha of .75. Inter-item correlations ranged from .26 to .89.

Sample:

The sample consisted of 941 graduate and undergraduate students at a midwestern university who completed the questionnaire in 102 (22 graduate and 80 undergraduate) intact classroom groups. In order to assure that the students represented all the departments of the university, the departments were grouped into 5 categories: natural science, humanities, social sciences, business and education. Classes were allocated proportionately according to these categories. All classes were picked randomly using the university's class catalog as a frame. Participation of students in filling out the questionnaire, and participation of instructors in allowing the researcher to administer the questionnaire during classtime was strictly voluntary. Of the 103 instructors contacted, only one refused to allow the researcher to administer the questionnaire. The sample's representation of males and females, caucasians and minorities was proportional to the university's student population. Sample characteristics are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Sample characteristics by gender, graduate/undergraduate and caucasian/minority ethnic background.

		Graduate	Undergraduate	Minority	Caucasian
Male	494	50	444	68	426
Female	447	60	387	50	397

N = 941

Procedure:

The purpose of the study was explained to instructors and students and assurances of confidentiality (to instructors) and anonymity (to students) were given. Students were instructed, by the researcher or an assistant, to fill out the questionnaire as it pertained to the instructor in that particular class. Precautions were taken so that no student filled out a questionnaire in more than one class. All records which could lead to the identification of instructors (ie. names, course numbers, etc.) were subsequently destroyed. Names of students were not recorded.

Data analysis:

Three comparisons were done; between caucasian and minority students, between males and females and between graduate and undergraduate students. Additional comparisons were done between male and female undergraduate students and between male and female minority students for a total of six comparisons. Chi square was computed between groups for each questionnaire item. Alpha was set at .05 with adjustments for multiple tests.

Results

Initial examination of the data revealed that overall, students at this university perceive that instructors encourage them to question or comment in class; that most instructors are nonverbally encouraging (ie. nod, smile, etc.); and appear interested when a student brings to class some unsolicited but relevant article or clipping. Fully 75% perceive that the instructor would encourage them to major in the instructor's field. 50% reported that they would go to the instructor for help if needed; 50% would feel comfortable going to the instructor's office during office hours and one third would feel comfortable visiting the instructor's office outside of office hours. Only 24% of the students claimed that they had never talked with the instructor outside of class.

Instructors were not perceived as being partial to either males or females; 70% reported that females are referred to as "women" instead of "girls" and 78% reported that males are referred to as "men". Students reported that faculty refer to hypothetical professionals in examples as both men and women 26% of the time (a doctor, he or she).

Comparison between caucasian and minority students:

In the comparison between caucasian and minority students small but highly significant differences emerged. For the purpose of this study, caucasian students were defined as those who were white American, while minority students were defined as those students from black, Hispanic, American Indian and Asian backgrounds.

Although more minority students felt that instructors knew their names, and were more often called on by name, they perceived that they were called on significantly less often than caucasians with 24% claiming that they were never called on or only once or twice during a semester course (32%). They felt ignored more often and felt that instructors were less attentive to them.

Minority students perceived that they were encouraged verbally more often, but that they were encouraged nonverbally less often. They felt that they were less likely to be rewarded for bringing unsolicited but relevant material to classes. They perceived that they were interrupted more frequently by classmates although not by instructors. They believed that they were touched by instructors significantly less often than caucasians and when they were touched they reported feeling both more encouraged as well as more irritated. 14% of this group appeared to feel that instructors showed partiality towards a group or groups and that instructors, at least occasionally, made comments which were offensive or belittling to a group. Results are summarized in table 2.

Table 2
Differences between caucasian and minority students of both genders

Caucasian/Minority	% Caucasian	% Minority
Known by name	65	71
Called on by name	37	41
Never called on or ignored	24	56
Instructor not attentive	32	41
Less likely to be rewarded for solicited material	64	59
Verbal encouragement	64	55
Never receives nonverbal encouragement	6	10
Touched by instructor	64	52
Feel encouraged by touch	14	25
Feel irritated by touch	1	7
Likely to go to instructor for help	56	70
Comfortable seeing instructor during office hours	73	83
Comfortable seeing instructor outside of office hours	58	66
Talks to instructor outside of class	56	63
Equal work in lab	22	15
Instructor shows partiality	4	14
Instructor belittles group(s)	10	14

All differences were significant at .01

Male/female comparisons:

In the comparison between male and female students, again, small but

statistically significant differences emerged. It was found that 69% of the males believed that the instructor knew their name, as compared to 63% of the females; 14% of the males reported not knowing if the instructor knew their name as compared to 22% of the females. Males and females were called on, or not called on, an equal number of times. They perceived that they were encouraged to the same degree.

Additional significant differences were seen in who they would turn to for help with coursework. It appeared that men were more likely to turn to the instructor while women preferred to get help from a classmate or friend. Men reported feeling comfortable visiting an instructor's office outside of office hours, while women reported feeling "somewhat hesitant". Instructors were not perceived as being partial to either men or women. Results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3
Differences between males and females

Male/Female	% Males	% Females
Known by name by instructor	69	62
Talks to instructor outside of class	61	55
Goes to instructor for help	60	55
Very comfortable seeing instructor outside of office hours	36	30
Hypothetical professionals only male	14	10
Never "squeezed out" of lab demonstrations	16	9

All differences were significant at .05.

Comparison between graduate and undergraduate students:

In comparisons between graduate and undergraduate students it appeared that graduate students believe instructors knew their name, were called on by name and were called on more frequently. They also perceived that the instructor was not only more attentive but that they were credited more often for their opinions than undergraduates. They perceived that they were rewarded for bringing unsolicited but relevant material to class. They felt

that they were encouraged to question and comment, both verbally and nonverbally and were not usually interrupted by the instructor.

More graduate than undergraduate students reported going to instructors for help when necessary as well as feeling more comfortable visiting an instructor's office both during and outside of office hours. Likewise, they were more likely to converse with faculty than undergraduate students.

According to graduate students, instructors labeled hypothetical professionals as exclusively male only 3% of the time as compared to 13% of the time in the case of undergraduates. Contributions of women were mentioned more often in graduate classes. More graduate than undergraduate students appeared to believe that the instructor never belittled a specific group (ie. women, minorities). Results are summarized in table 4.

Table 4

Differences between graduate and undergraduate students

Graduate/undergraduate	% Graduate	% Undergraduate
Known by name	81	64
Called on by name	55	35
Called on 1-3 times/week	40	30
Encouraged to question and comment	76	54
Nonverbal encouragement	60	41
Never interrupted by instructor	68	49
Rewarded for unsolicited material	77	61
Encouraged to major in instructor's field	82	74
Instructor usually attentive	77	65
Goes to instructor for help	82	54
Talks to instructor outside of class	76	57
Comfortable seeing instructor during office hours	74	47
Comfortable seeing instructor outside office hours	56	30
Hypothetical professionals only male	3	13
Mentions contributions of women	17	9
Men credited for opinions	43	28
Women credited for opinions	41	27
Instructor never belittles groups	90	80

All differences were significant at .05.

Differences between male/female undergraduate students:

In comparing male and female undergraduate students it appeared that men

perceived themselves as less likely to be "squeezed out" of lab projects and/or class demonstrations than women. Men perceived that the work in group projects was either shared equally or that they did most of it. Men reported that they were likely to either get help from the instructor or to try to work out problems by themselves while women seemed to prefer to get help from a classmate or friend rather than go to the instructor. More men than women talked to instructors outside of class. Significantly more men than women reported feeling very comfortable visiting an instructor's office outside of o ice hours. In undergraduate classes, according to these students, contributions by women were referred to by instructors only 8% of the time. Results are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5
Differences between male and female undergraduate students

Male/female	% Male	% Female
Never "squeezed out" of lab demonstrations	17	9
Equal work in group projects	26	19
"I" do most work in group projects	6	3
Goes to instructor for help	58	50
Goes to friends for help	29	41
Talks to instructor outside of class	60	50
Very comfortable seeing instructor outside of office hours	61	50
Instructor mentions contributions by women to the field of study	males and females: 8%	

All differences were significant at .05

Comparison between male and female minority students:

In a comparison between male and female minority students, no significant differences were found.

Discussion

Results of the study indicate that, in general, minority students perceive a less encouraging atmosphere than caucasian students, women students perceive a less favorable climate than men do and graduate students perceive a more encouraging atmosphere than undergraduate students. It matters little whether these perceptions are accurate, for perceptions cause beliefs which lead to behavior, which in this case may be behaviors which lead to the lowering of academic aspirations and achievements of minorities and women.

The comparison between caucasian and minority students is the most interesting and the most complex. A pattern emerges which appears to be that conscious and deliberate efforts to affirm and encourage the minority student are negated by nonconscious behaviors. Minority students perceive that names of individuals are better known and used, but fewer are called; there is more verbal but less nonverbal encouragement; they perceive themselves as being touched less often but report feeling both more encouraged and more irritated when they are touched. This may depend upon accompanying gestures, tone of voice and word usage. Perhaps due to greater sensitivity, minority students claim that instructors are partial to some groups and that, at least on occasion, belittle groups or individuals. All this may have a bearing on the fact that fully 20% of the minority students reported that they never participate in class while only 9% of the caucasian students reported never participating in class.

There are many reasons why no differences were found between minority males and females. The most plausible explanation is that the minority stereotype may override the female stereotype, that the behavior of instructors, as perceived by the students, differentiates more sharply between caucasian and minority than between male and female minority students. On the other hand, it may be that if differences do exist between male and

female minority students, the sample was not large enough to detect them.

In line with previous research (Hall, 1982), this study indicates that instructors are thought to know the names of more males than females. Several explanations come to mind. If males were more likely to request help from the instructor, instructors would get to know them better; on the other hand, perhaps the opposite is true, they request more help because the instructors know them better. A third possibility which cannot be overlooked is that this might be a misperception. Having been socialized to feel important, males simply assume that instructors know their name.

It appears that females are less assertive than males. They allow themselves to be "squeezed out" of lab projects and demonstrations, and are more hesitant to intrude upon an instructor's time; demanding less help from instructors and being more hesitant to talk to instructors outside of class. These differences are in line with gender role theories which state that women are trained to "know their place" (Bem, 1975), and thus, male assertive behavior is reinforced more often by faculty.

It was interesting to note that contrary to anecdotal reports, males felt that in group projects the work was either evenly divided or that they did most of it. Whether this is a misperception by the "macho" male or whether anecdotal reports refer to inconsequential work aspects of group projects (ie. typing the final draft or cleaning the work area) remains to be proven. As Thorne (1979) found in other samples, it is possible that faculty place males in a position of leadership and expect that they will do most of the work.

Differences between graduate and undergraduate female students were found to be more pronounced. Some of these differences may be a function of class size. Since graduate classes are considerably smaller than undergraduate classes, the instructor has a greater opportunity to learn students names, call on them by name and call on them more frequently. Other differences may

be a function of age and status. The graduate student, being more mature and more focused in a particular field, probably has more interests in common with faculty than the undergraduate. This might explain the differential in comfort in visiting the instructors' offices and conversing with instructors outside of class. Other differences are not so easily explained; that is, being given credit for opinions or comments, attentiveness to responses, rewarding the bringing to class of unsolicited material and the exclusive use of males as examples of professionals. The first three factors would seem to indicate that faculty, in general, are perceived as respecting the graduate student more than the undergraduate student. As for the latter, it is possible that the difference lies within the students themselves, that female graduate students elicit more female professional examples than undergraduates.

There are many implications for further research in this area. Observational methods should be used to determine whether the perceptions of the students are accurate. Observational methods could be used to identify and detect nonverbal behaviors of instructors which might inadvertently be encouraging or discouraging to specific groups of students. Additionally, these methods might detect whether it is the instructor or the student who initiates these behaviors with the other merely reacting instead of acting.

In summary, and with the exception of the comparison between male and female minority students, small but statistically significant differences emerged between the relevant comparison groups. These findings appear to indicate that students do experience differential treatment in the classroom related to gender and race. Furthermore, this differential treatment may be a contributing factor in the lower academic aspirations of women and minorities.

References

Bavelas, A., Hastorf, A. H., Gross, A. E., & Kite, W. R. Experiements on the alteration of group sturcture. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 55-70.

Bem, S. L., & Bem, D. J. Training the woman to know her place. In D. J. Bem Beliefs, Attitudes, and Human Affairs. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Cook, M. Gaze and mutual gaze in social encounters. American Scientist, 1977, 65, 328-333.

Dweck, C. S., Davidson, W., Nelson, S., & Enna, B. Sex differences in learned helplessness . II. The contingencies of evaluative feedback in the classroom. III. An experimental analysis. Developmental Psychology, 1978, 14, 268-276.

Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, 1959.

Hall, R. M. The classroom climate: A chilly one for women? Washington D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, February, 1982.

Henley, N. M. Body politics. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1977.

Kalsbeek, D. St. Louis University student life studies: Research report. St. Louis, Mo.: St. Louis University, Student Life Research Office, 1982.

Kalsbeek, D. Personal communication. August, 1984.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Rowe, M. R. The Saturns rings phenomenon: Micro-inequities and unequal opportunity in the American economy. In P. Bourne & V. Paines, (eds.) Proceedings of the National Science Foundation Conference on Women's Leadership & Authority. University of California, Santa Cruz, Ca.: 1977.

Thorne, B. Claiming verbal space. Paper presented at the Research Conference on Educational Environments and the Undergraduate Woman, Wellesley College, September, 1979.

Appendix A

Please answer the following questions by placing a check mark in the appropriate space or filling in the blanks as indicated. Answer each question as it pertains to this instructor in this class. Do not write your name, your instructor's name, the course title or number on the questionnaire.

1. Year in school: 1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ Grad. School____

2. Sex: M____ F____

3. Year of birth____

4. Major (if officially declared)_____

5. If you declared a major, and then changed; you changed from_____ to_____

6. This course is:

   a.____required b.____not required

7. What is your ethnic background?

   a.____white American b.____black American c.____Hispanic

   d.____Native American (North American Indian) e.____Asian

8. Does the instructor know you by name?

   a.____yes

   b.____no

   c.____don't know

9. How often does the instructor call on you or ask you to respond to a question or comment?

   a.____the instructor does not call on anyone

   b.____one to three times during the course

   c.____two or three times a week or more

   d.____never

10. How does the instructor react to the questions you ask in class?

a.____encourages me to question or comment again

b.____discourages me from commenting or asking a question again

c.____neither encourages nor discourages me

d.____I never participate

11. How does the instructor most frequently call on you?

a.____by name

b.____by pointing with hand

c.____by eye contact (looking directly at me)

d.____instructor never calls on me

e.____instructor never calls on anyone

12. Are there times when you answer a question or make a comment that you feel you fail to hold the instructor's attention?

a.____once or twice

b.____almost every time I respond to a question or comment

c.____the instructor is usually attentive

d.____I never respond to a question or comment

13. In the lab, do you feel "squeezed out" from viewing a laboratory assignment or demonstration?

a.____never, I always get a clear view

b.____occasionally

c.____frequently; I often find myself in the back

d.____the instructor makes sure everyone can see well

e.____does not apply to this class

14. Do you talk with this instructor outside of class?

a.____never

b.____one time

c.____occasionally

d.____frequently

15. When you answer a question or offer a comment are you interrupted by the instructor?

a.____never

b.____once or twice

c.____frequently

d.____I never answer a question or offer a comment

16. If you had a problem in understanding some material in this class, how comfortable would you feel visiting this instructor's office <u>outside</u> the instructor's office hours?

a.____very comfortable

b.____somewhat comfortable

c.____neither comfortable nor hesitant

d.____somewhat hesitant

e.____very hesitant

17. Are there times when you raise your hand to ask a question or make a comment and <u>do</u> <u>not</u> get called on by the instructor?

a.____once or twice

b.____three or more times

c.____I am called on when I raise my hand

d.____I never raise my hand

18. Has the instructor in this class ever touched you in a friendly manner? That is, given you a pat on the shoulder or back?

a.____never

b.____once or twice

c.____frequently

d.____the instructor never touches anyone

19. When the instructor touches you in a friendly manner, how do you feel?

a.____encouraged

b.____embarrassed

c.____neutral

d.____irritated

e.____the instructor never touches anyone

20. The instructor refer to females as:

a.____girls

b.____women

21. If you saw a piece in the newspaper which would relate to the subject matter in this class and you cut it out and gave it to the instructor; in your opinion would the instructor:

a.____be interested and mention it in class

b.____suspect your motive

c.____be interested but not mention it in class

d.____I would not do this

e.____ignore it

22. When you answer a question or offer a comment are you interrupted by fellow classmates?

a.____never

b.____once or twice

c.____frequently

d.____I never answer a question or offer a comment

23. If you talked to this instructor about majoring in this department, in your opinion would this instructor:

a.____encourage you

b.____discourage you

c.____ignore you

d.____neither encourage nor discourage you

24. In a lab or other group project, when I work with a partner or with a group the work is:

a.____equally shared

b.____done by one person only other than myself

c.____I usually end up doing all the work

d.____does not apply to this course

25. If you needed help in this course would you go to:

a.____the instructor

b.____a classmate

c.____someone who has taken this course in the past

d.____nobody, I would try to work it out by myself

26. When you answer a question or make a comment, does the instructor encourage you by nodding, gesturing, smiling, etc.?

a.____sometimes

b.____almost every time I respond to a question or comment

c.____very seldom (only once or twice

d.____I never respond to a question or comment

27. Does the instructor use references that you feel are offensive, embarrassing or belittling to individuals or groups?

a.____never

b.____one time

c.____occasionally

d.____frequently

28. The instructor mentions contributions made by women to this academic field:

a.____often

b.____sometimes

c.____seldom

d.____never

e.____does not apply to this course

29. When referring to hypothetical professionals in examples, ie. doctors, accountants, managers, etc., does the instructor classify them as:

a.____male

b.____female

c.____sometimes male, sometimes female

d.____I have not noticed

30. When a male student offers an opinion or comment, does the instructor give the student credit, ie. "...as John pointed out..."?

a.____often

b.____sometimes

c.____seldom

d.____never

e.____does not apply to this course

31. If you had a problem in understanding some material in this class, how comfortable would you feel seeing the instructor during the instructor's office hours?

a.____very comfortable

b.____somewhat comfortable

c.____neither comfortable nor hesitant

d.____somewhat hesitant

e.____very hesitant

32. When a female student offers an opinion or comment does the instructor give the student credit, ie."...as Mary pointed out..."?

a.____often

b.____sometimes

c.____seldom

d.____never

e.____does not apply to this course

33. In your opinion the instructor in this class is partial to:

a.____males

b.____females

c.____some groups

d.____the instructor does not show partiality

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!!

If you have any comments please write them in the space below.